



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TRISTAN ON THE CONTINENT BEFORE 1066.

It is now supposed that the story of Tristan was first made known to the French, and by them to the rest of the Continent, through the Norman conquest of England.¹ The reason for this opinion is a negative one, and is based on the absence of allusions to the legend, and of proper names peculiar to it, from documents antecedent to 1066. Yet in the records of the Norman invasion of Italy the name of Tristan occurs more than once during the eleventh century, and under circumstances which do not leave any doubt regarding its genuineness.

Towards 1075 the monk Amatus, of the convent of Monte Cassino, wrote a chronicle in Latin on the emigration of the Normans to Italy and their fortunes in that peninsula during the next half-century. This chronicle has disappeared, but a translation of it, done into French during the first quarter of the fourteenth century, has come down to modern times, and has been edited twice as *Ystoire de li Normant*.² In this French version we read that when Henry of Germany left lower Italy in 1022 he handed over to his allies, the nephews of the Greek rebel, Melos, a small body of Normans led by a certain "Trostayne."³ And twenty years later, when Apulia was divided among the twelve Norman chiefs who had united to seize it, this same leader, or a homonym, received as his share the district of Monte Peloso.⁴

Amatus' original has been lost, but other Latin chronicles of events in South Italy during the eleventh century have been saved. One of them was written by a contemporary of Amatus, the future bishop of Ostia, Leo de Marsico († 1115), and ends towards 1075, the year which saw Amatus at work. Leo's narrative forms a part of the general *Chronicon monasterii Casinensis*.⁵ In many details it closely resembles Amatus'. Leo also

mentions the band of Normans given to Melos' nephews by Emperor Henry. He names several, and among them is Trostayne.⁶ And when Apulia is apportioned among the twelve it is again Tristan who receives Monte Peloso.⁷ It is evident that Amatus and Leo are drawing on the same sources, and their very fidelity is manifested by their failure to reconcile the spellings of the name. Of course, the Trostayne of 1022 may not be the Tristan of 1042. Leo could hardly have thought he was, since he does not repeat his epithet of "balbus."

The Monte Cassino chronicle was taken up where Leo left it by Peter the Deacon, and was continued by him to the year 1139. Peter the Deacon was a full generation younger than Leo. He could have had little personal knowledge of events previous to 1100, and must have relied on written documents for the earlier part of his history. But whatever his means of information, they conveyed to him items connected with the name Tristan. Under date of 1096 he speaks of Robert, who was a son of Trosten, and again in 1109 of Robert, the son of Tristan,⁸ clearly the same person. And finally, in 1122, another Tristan appears.⁹

The evidence that among the Norman invaders of lower Italy was found a knight called Trostayn or Tristan seems indisputable. Indeed there may have been two of that name. We cannot tell. Nor do we know whether the Tristan of Monte Peloso is the father of the Robert of 1096 and 1109. Genealogists may eventually determine this point. But what we are warranted by the statements of both Amatus and Leo in assuming is, that a Norman, born not later than 1000, was given the name of the great Celtic hero. And we also see from their uncertain spelling, and from the variations of Peter the Deacon, that in

⁶ "Torstainum balbum." Pertz, VII, p. 655 (Book II, c. 41).

⁷ "Tristaino Montem pilosum." Pertz, VII, p. 676 (Book II, c. 66).

⁸ "Robbertus, filius Trosteni"—"Cum Robberto, filio Tristayni." Pertz, VII, p. 766 (Book IV, c. 11), and p. 778 (Book IV, c. 34). The editor adds in a note to the second citation (n. 43) that other documents of the day spell "Trostayni."

⁹ "Trostaynus cum familia sua." Pertz, VII, p. 799 (Book IV, c. 71).

¹ See J. Bédier, *Roman de Tristan*, vol. II, p. 129; F. Lot, *Romania*, xxxv, pp. 596, 597.

² First, by the Société de l'Histoire de France, and, more recently, by the Société de l'Histoire de Normandie (1892).

³ "Trostayne avec .xxiiij. Normant." Book I, c. 30.

⁴ "Tristan Monte Pelouz." Book II, c. 30.

⁵ Published by Pertz: *Monumenta Germ. Hist.*, Scriptores VII, pp. 574 ff.

Italy, at least, the pronunciation of that name wavered throughout the eleventh century between *Trostayn* and *Tristayn*, with the balance inclining towards the former. Since Peter the Deacon calls the last one of the family he mentions *Trostayn*, and since he is speaking of a contemporary (the date is of 1122), we may well believe that this pronunciation had become the established one. This view would be fortified by the testimony of other records, alluded to by the editor of Pertz.¹⁰ Now some twenty years ago or more Ferdinand Lot made the suggestion that the French poems on Tristan give that form only because of a fancied etymology with the adjective *triste*. This idea of Lot's receives its first confirmation from Amatus, Leo and especially from Peter the Deacon.¹¹

Still the presence of one (or two) Norman knights named Tristan before the middle of the eleventh century may not mean any more than that fact. The Normans knew the name, had known it since 1000 at the latest. They may have known nothing of the legend. It is probable that the name came to them through an intermarriage with some Breton in the tenth century, and as an isolated instance. Or the ancestor who gave the name may have crossed the Channel directly from Wales or Cornwall, without passing through Armorican territory. That is, a Northern Celt bearing a Celtic name would have emigrated to Normandy and have founded a family there. He may have brought the legend with him and he may not. And in the case of an intermarriage with a Breton, the legend may have gone with the name, and it may not. Amatus and Leo tell us that the Normans knew the name two generations at least before they conquered England. As to the story, they are silent.

F. M. WARREN.

Yale University.

¹⁰ See note 8 above.

¹¹ That *Trostayn* (*Drostan*) and *Tristan* are the same word was established by H. Zimmer, in *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur*, XIII, pp. 58 ff.; cf. Bédier, *Roman de Tristan*, vol. II, pp. 106 ff. Did Chrétien de Troyes take advantage of the two pronunciations to create beside the hero Tristan (*Érec* 1248) another Tristan, "qui onques ne rist" (*Érec* 1713), or had popular etymology not yet completed its task, so that the sorrowful Tristan, begotten by the misfortunes of the Celtic Tristan, still enjoyed a shadowy existence, apart from his progenitor?

THE FIRST FOLIO OF SHAKESPEARE, AND THE NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

The First Folio edition of Shakespeare's Plays is, as Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps has said, the most interesting and valuable book in the whole range of English literature. It is the sole authority for twenty of the plays, and for the rest is still regarded by critics as, in the main, the most authentic text, the nearest approach, in spite of errors and imperfections, to what Shakespeare actually wrote. The editors, John Heminge and Henry Condell, were Shakespeare's friends and fellow-actors, whose names appear along with his in the printed list of actors. The Dedication, address "to William Earle of Pembroke and Philip Earle of Montgomery," is in the obsequious style of the time, which continued in vogue until 1755, when Dr. Johnson by his famous letter to the Earl of Chesterfield, on the publication of his dictionary, gave the death-blow to patronage. Here is a sample of "The Epistle Dedicatorie": "For, when we valew the places your H. H. (Highnesses) sustaine, we cannot but know their dignity greater, then to descend to the reading of these trifles; and, while we name them trifles, we have depriv'd our selves of the defence of our Dedication." In their address "To the great Variety of Readers" the editors say:

"It had bene a thing, we confesse, worthie to have bene wished, that the Author himselfe had liv'd to have set forth, and overseen his owne writings; But since it hath bin ordain'd otherwise, and he by death departed from that right, we pray you do not envie his Friends, the office of their care, and paine, to have collected and publish'd them; and so to have publish'd them, as where (before) you were abus'd with diverse stolne, and surreptitious copies, maimed, and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of injurious impostors, that expos'd them; even those, are now offer'd to your view cur'd, and perfect of their limbes; and all the rest, absolute in their numbers, as he conceived them. Who, as he was a happie imitator of Nature, was a most gentle expresser of it. His mind and hand went together: and what he thought, he uttered with that easinesse, that wee have scarce received from him a blot in his papers."